

REMARKS

A. Introduction

Claims 1-5 and 7-9 were pending and under consideration in the application.

In the Office Action of December 2, 2008 claims 2 and 3 were objected to for lack of antecedent basis and claims 1-5 and 7-9 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a), as being unpatentable over *Cariffe*, U.S. 6,281,872 (hereinafter, “*Cariffe*”) in view of *Barrett*, et al., U.S. 5,301,036 (hereinafter, “*Barrett*”).

In response, Applicants are hereby canceling claim 2, 8, and 9, amending claim 3 to cure the lack of antecedent basis noted by the Office Action, and amending the independent claims, claims 1, 5, and 7, for clarity. No new matter is being added.

B. Rejections under 35 U.S.C. 103(a)

Claims 1-5 and 7-9 were rejected were rejected as being unpatentable over *Cariffe* in view of *Barrett*.

Cariffe relates to methods for implementing a rotation interface for an image where, in response to a rotation control selection of a current angle of rotation an image is rotated to the current angle of rotation.

As the office action concedes, *Cariffe* fails to teach or suggest simultaneously rotating both the print image and the print-medium image. In fact, *Cariffe* completely fails to teach or suggest rotating or displaying a print-medium image in any manner, as recited in each of the independent claims. The Office Action’s assertion at page 3 to the contrary, that *Cariffe*, Fig. 2, element 41, somehow “shows the print medium or the paper which is going to be used to print the flower which is the image”, is not supported by the actual disclosure of *Cariffe*. Nothing in *Cariffe* suggests that element 41 relates in any way to a print medium or paper. Element 41 is

characterized in *Cariffe* as a “digitally represented image”. At col. 2, lines 15-40, it is explained that a user may crop, zoom in or out, cut or paste, rotate, and otherwise edit digitally represented image 41. Thus, element 41 may, at most read on applicants’ “print image”. Nothing, however, suggests that element 41, or anything else disclosed by *Cariffe*, is a print-medium image. Indeed, the word “medium” is not found in *Cariff* in any context, nor are possible synonyms such as “paper” or “sheet”. Thus, *Cariffe* fails to teach or suggest displaying and rotating a print-medium image, as recited in each of independent claims 1, 5, and 7.

Barrett is cited for disclosing simultaneously rotating both the print image and the print-medium image. Whether or not this is true, such disclosure fails to cure the deficiency noted above. As a result, claims 1, 5, and 7, and their respective dependent claims are patentable over the combination of *Cariffe* and *Barrett*.

C. Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, it is submitted that claims 1, 3-5, and 7 are allowable and that the application is in condition for allowance. Early notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that, for any reason, direct contact with Applicants’ attorney would help advance the prosecution of this case to finality, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at the number given below, for purposes of arranging for a telephonic interview. Any communication initiated by this paragraph should be deemed an Applicant-Initiated Interview.

Serial No.: 10/823,940
Docket No.: 09792909-5866
Amendment "C" dated February 11, 2009
Reply to the Office Action of December 2, 2008

If any further fees are required in connection with the filing of this amendment, please charge the same to our Deposit Account No. 19-3140.

Respectfully submitted,

SONNENSCHN NATH & ROSENTHAL LLP

By / Michael L. Day /

Michael L. Day, Reg. No. 55101

P.O. Box 061080

Wacker Drive Station, Sears Tower

Chicago, IL 60606-1080

415-882-5064 (telephone)

415-882-0300 (facsimile)

ATTORNEYS FOR APPLICANTS